EXHIBIT 1

Paul Hastings

Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP 875 15th Street, N.W. - Washington, DC 20005 telephone 202 551 1700 - facsimile 202 551 1705 - www.paulhastings.com

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

m: company/office: facsimile: telephone: Brian Seal Howrey LLP (202) 383-6610 (202) 383-6904 Renee L. Stasio Howrey LLP (202) 383-6610 (202) 383-7176 from: facsimile: telephone: initials: Brandon M. White (202) 551-0154 (202) 551-1754 BMW2

client name:

Bridgestone Sports

client matter number:

70416.00002

date:

March 15, 2007

pages (with cover):

3

comments:

if you do not receive all pages, please call immediately Facsimile Center: (202) 551-1275

Paul Hastings

Paul, Hastings, Janotsky & Walker u.e. 875 15th Street, N.W. • Washington, DC 20005 lelephone 202 551 1700 · facsimile 202 551 1705 · www.paulhastings.com

Arlanta Belling Brussels Chicago Hong Kong London Los Angeles Milan New York **Orange County** Palo Alto Paris San Diego San Francisco Shanghal Stamford Tokyo

Washington, DC

(202) 551-1754

brandonwhite@paulhastings.com

March 15, 2007

70416,000002

VIA FACSIMILE TO (202) 383-6610

Ms. Renee L. Stasio Howrey LLP

1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.

Washington, DC 20004

Mr. Brian S. Seal Howrey LLP

1299 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. Washington, DC 20004

Re: Bridgestone Sports v Acushnet

Dear Renee and Brian:

This letter responds to recent letters we have received from both of you regarding expert discovery.

February 26, 2007, Stasio to White

Regarding the samples of BR 40 and BR 60, I expect to have the remaining portions of the samples returned to you this week.

Regarding Zn PCTP, we had agreed that we did not need a sample of BR 730 from Acushnet based on your informing me that the sample of BR 730 utilized by Dr. Koenig was the sample produced by Bridgestone. Regarding a sample of Zn PCTP, it was necessary to obtain a sample of this material from Acushnet as Bridgestone cannot know the purity of Acushnet's Zn PCTP or any excipients or compounding agents added to Acushnet's Zn PCTP.

Regarding Acushnet's untimely production of Wilson Ultra Competition 90 golf balls, we disagree with you on this issue. Acushnet seems to have approached the Court-ordered discovery deadlines in this case as if they simply did not exist – this alone is prejudicial to Bridgestone.

Regarding the materials produced at the inspection at Packer Engineering on February 8 and 9, it was never represented that we would produce for "inspection all the golf balls, golf ball components and materials thereof that Bridgestone's experts relied upon and/or considered in connection with their initial experts reports...." What was made available for your inspection were all materials tested by Dr. Caulfield,

Renee L. Stasio Brian S. Seal March 15, 2007 Page 2

II. February 23, 2007, Seal to White

Regarding Bridgestone's 35 U.S.C. § 112 defenses against U.S. Patent No. 4,729,861, U.S. Patent No. 4,936,587, and U.S. Patent No. 5,080,367, we do not confirm that we are no longer challenging the validity of these patents on this basis. No expert testimony is required from Bridgestone's own experts.

Regarding Acushnet's request to withdraw its admission to Bridgestone's Request for Admission No. 7, we cannot agree to this withdrawal. Bridgestone's request was not limited to Dr. Caulfield's data.

III. February 23, 2007, Seal to White

Regarding Acushnet's request that Bridgestone withdraw most of its expert reports, we cannot agree to your request to withdraw these reports.

Verification of Interrogatory Responses IV.

I still have not received your response to my request to provide a verification of Acushnet's interrogatory responses. Please let me know as soon as possible whether Acushnet will agree to verify its interrogatory responses.

Sincerely,

Brandon M. White

for PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

LEGAL_US_E # 74518684.1